

## **Salmon and Miller/Walker Basin Planning Effort Project Management Team Meeting**

Date: Thursday October 3, 2002

Time: 9:00AM – 11:00AM

Location: Burien City Hall, City Manager's Conference Room

### **Meeting Summary**

#### ***Attendees***

Steve Clark	City of Burien	206-248-5514
Dan Bath	City of Burien	206-439-3154
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac	206-439-4741
Tom Hubbard	Port of Seattle	206-248-7135
Carol Hunter	WSDOT	206-464-1219
Curt Crawford	King County	206-296-8329
Louise Kulzer	King County	206-296-1980
Julie Cairn	King County	206-296-8032

#### ***Introductions and General Discussion***

Meeting participants introduced themselves. The goals of the meeting were briefly overviewed.

There was discussion about community sensitivities regarding the project and the perceived interrelationships between the Port's mitigation for the 3<sup>rd</sup> runway and their participation in the Salmon and Miller/Walker Basin Planning efforts.

Staff presence in the field, as well as responses to the mailing of the right of entry letters have highlighted these sensitivities. The PMT agreed that having the Fact Sheet completed and available should address many of the common questions and concerns. This is discussed more later on in the Summary.

#### ***Discussion of Build-Out Condition Assumptions***

There was discussion about the definition of "build-out conditions". There was a specific question about the impervious surface assumptions based on zoning, and whether the values used are in the design manual or whether they are jurisdictionally specific. Curt mentioned that the King County Design Manual has assumptions for impervious cover. These are in Tables 3.2.2.D and 3.2.2.E.

Based on this several additional questions, it became clear that a working session related to modeling and to build-out assumptions would be useful for the PMT. They would like Kelly Whiting to present an overview of the modeling and to discuss the build-out

Action items are highlighted

conditions and how the modeling includes or does not include assumptions related to activities in the partner jurisdictions.

### ***Budget and Schedule Updates***

Julie Cairn distributed an updated Budget Report showing expended Project costs compared to the ILA estimates, and showing the cost shares per Partner. The report reflected King County payroll data through September 1, 2002.

Louise Kulzer gave a brief update on the overall project schedule. The Salmon model is complete, but is not calibrated. There will be some delays in the project since Kelly Whiting is changing jobs within the County, and the modeling work will need to be transitioned. There are also some Engineering task delays, but they will probably not be longer than the modeling staff transition delays – estimated at 4 weeks.

The estimates of year-end expenditures (and partner cost shares) will be less than previously estimated, corresponding with the delays in some project tasks.

### ***Project Fact Sheet***

The group discussed the Fact Sheet that was drafted and sent out to the PMT last week. There were additional comments on the overall tone, and suggested edits and additions.

Louise will incorporate the input from the meeting and circulate a revised version to the PMT via email.

The group discussed various strategies for distributing this information – from direct mailings out to the property owners who received the Right of Entry letters, to a broader audience via local and community newspapers and newsletters. The group seemed to favor a broader approach to communicating this information, rather than targeting an audience we were already in contact with.

### ***Project Success Criteria***

The group brainstormed characteristics that would cause PMT members to consider the project a success. The notes from the brainstorming effort (prior to categorizing or otherwise sorting and combining the notes) are attached to this meeting summary at the end.

### ***Regional vs. Joint vs. Shared***

The group discussed alternative terms and definitions in place of “Regional”, which has a much broader geographic context for specific issues (like transportation).

After a lengthy discussion, the group settled on “Joint” as an acceptable categorization of problems. Shared also seems like it would work with the group.

The definitions of Joint and Local were accepted. However, in trying to apply these categories to some of the Salmon Basin problems, it became clear that these definitions might need to be further modified. (See next section). The definitions are attached at the end of this document.

Action items are highlighted

### ***Discussion of Salmon Creek Preliminary Problems***

The meeting was nearing its scheduled end time, we tried to categorize the Salmon Basin problems as Local or Joint. This is significant, because additional analysis is not scheduled to be conducted on problems that are designated as “Local.”

The task of classifying the problems as Local or Joint proved to be difficult. There are some tasks which are clearly one or the other, and many which are in-between.

After some discussion, it was determined that PMT members did not necessarily have enough information and context about problems, and that a working session in the field would be useful.

The list of Salmon problems, along with the preliminary designation of Local vs. Joint (where it was discussed) is included as an attachment.

The current set of Salmon problems is probably still somewhat tentative, so it was suggested that an engineering meeting be held prior to the full PMT working session. The purpose of the engineering meeting is to provide an opportunity to discuss more technical engineering issues and problems, and perhaps to help prioritize the sites that the PMT will visit during the field working session.

A map that had the Lake Garrett basin, the drainage lines, and the currently identified problem locations was requested to be developed for the meeting.

### ***Additional and Upcoming Meetings***

The PMT membership identified several additional meetings that are needed to assist in completing tasks. Below is a listing of these additional meetings, proposed purpose, proposed attendees, and relative timing:

<b>Meeting Topic</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Proposed Attendees</b>	<b>Duration, Relative Timing, and Responsibility</b>
Modeling Methodology and Assumptions	To get a briefing from Kelly Whiting on the overall modeling methodology, and to provide a forum to discuss the assumptions that go into the modeling, and how local projects either fit within these assumptions or need to be addressed individually	Most PMT members and Kelly Whiting, Jeff Jacobson?	2 hours? Probably hold meeting downtown?  Louise will work on getting this scheduled.

Meeting Topic	Purpose	Proposed Attendees	Duration, Relative Timing, and Responsibility
Engineering Meeting	Discuss mapping issues, lack of information.  Discuss engineering aspects of Salmon Basin problems.  Address information gaps  Reduce/prioritize problems for the PMT Field Work Session.	Doug Chin, Ken Krank, Dan Bath, Steve Clark?, Dale Schroeder, Curt Crawford, Louise Kulzer,	Must happen before the PMT Field Work Session.  Louise will ask Doug to schedule this. She'll support as needed.
PMT Field Work Session	Look at some of the Salmon Basin problems  Categorize the problems as Local vs. Joint	PMT, Doug Chin, Mason Bowles	½ day. Louise will work with Steve Clark and/or Dan Bath to get this arranged. Steve offered the use of the City of Burien mini-bus. Is a CDL required for this vehicle?
<b>November 7<sup>th</sup> PMT Meeting, 9-11AM</b>	<b>This date and time slot could be used for any of the above meetings.</b>  Originally, Miller/Walker preliminary problems were going to be presented to the PMT by King County staff. This will be delayed until the December PMT Meeting. Prioritization Criteria also still need to be discussed.		
December 5 <sup>th</sup> PMT Meeting, 9-11AM	December PMT Agenda depends on progress on tasks above.		

***Meeting Handouts referenced in the minutes (double click to open file)***

FINAL Meeting Summary for September PMT Meeting	
Project Success Criteria Brainstorming Results (prior to editing)	<a href="#">100302PMTAtt02</a>
Definitions of Joint and Local, to apply to Problems	<a href="#">100302PMTAtt03</a>
Matrix of Salmon Creek Problems, with some notes on Local/Joint as discussed during the meeting.	<a href="#">100302PMTAtt04</a>

Miller and Salmon/Walker Basin Planning Efforts  
Success Criteria Brainstorming Results  
From 10/3/02 PMT Meeting

**Question: What outcomes need to exist for you to consider the project a success?**

**Brainstorm of Answers:**

The recommendations have a positive cost-benefit factor

Questions regarding regulations are answered [talk to Curt to get more detail on the specific questions he had in mind]

The communication strategy used for the project results in improved public trust and increased credibility related to the project

The recommendations support improved flow, improved flood control, and improved water quality

The plan identifies projects that we can get permits for

The plan identifies projects that we can implement

The plan identifies steps that can be taken that will increase and improve habitat for fish and other aquatic life

The plan has broader community support than the project currently has

Practical programmatic approach

The recommendations should include various types of solutions (such as):

- Public education and outreach
- Joint solutions
- Local solutions
- Capital projects
- Maintenance procedures/BMPs

Develop and monitor success criteria for elements implemented

Adaptive management

Support (or at least concurrence) from federal, state, and local regulatory agencies

PMT members are still communicating professionally and collaboratively when the plan is completed

Able to agree on priorities (both for the problems, and then later for the solutions)

The resulting plan is unanimously adopted by partner organizations; and financial support to implement recommendations is raised

The plan should identify implementation and funding strategies

## **Miller/Walker & Salmon Planning Efforts**

### **Definitions of Joint and Local, to be used in categorizing Basin Problems As accepted at the 10/3/02 PMT Meeting**

**Joint\* problems** are generally those that involve more than one jurisdiction or which impact the sustainability and functionality of the drainage basin.

**Local problems** are those that impact only one jurisdiction and only a small isolated portion of the basin. Local problems also have relatively minor environmental impacts when viewed on a basin-wide scale, and are not expected to impact the overall sustainability and functionality of the drainage basin.

#### **Applicability**

Issues, whether Joint or Local, look at many aspects of the basin's sustainability and functionality, such as:

- flooding
- hydraulics / quantity of flow
- natural drainage systems
- constructed drainage systems
- interconnections between natural and constructed systems
- ecological conditions (to support fish and amphibians)
- water quality
- geology / slope stability
- public health and safety

\* We are using Joint in place of Regional, because of the broader context that the term Regional often connotes. This is especially the case in the Puget Sound Region with respect to transportation planning and projects.

**SALMON CREEK BASIN PROBLEMS**  
**September 18, 2002 (Revised October 9\*, 2002)**

A survey of existing information about problems was performed in the Salmon Creek Basin to assess stream, wetland and associated wildlife habitat condition and problems, geologic problems, engineering and drainage problems, and water quality problems. In most cases, existing information sources were used to determine and describe problems. In the case of Ecological and Geological disciplines, a stream walk was made to determine problems. After finalization, the existing problems in the basin will be prioritized, and for problems identified as regional, sufficient engineering and environmental analysis will take place to identify solutions for the highest priority problems of regional significance.

**Problem categories**

- 1. Ecological (stream flows and habitat, fisheries, wetlands)
- 2. Geological (steep, unstable slopes)
- 3. Drainage and Engineering (flooding, infrastructure)
- 4. Water Quality (streams, wetlands, lakes, groundwater)

October 2, 2002 NOTE: Upon further consideration, some of the items in the table below are information needs or they are conditions that present opportunities, rather than truly being problems. Items that are not problems have been left in the table, but they have been shaded.

October 9, 2002 NOTE: October 9<sup>th</sup> Revisions reflect discussions at the October 3<sup>rd</sup> PMT Meeting related to Local vs. Joint  
There are also additional problems to be added to this matrix after King County and Burien staff meet. Some data gaps may also be filled.

**Table 1: Initial Problem Identification**

No	Problem	Location	Description	Trib. & River Mile	Possible Additional investigations / Possible solutions	Source	Local, Joint, Combination?
			<b>ECOLOGICAL</b>				
1	Habitat	Reach 3	Upstream of sedimentation problems. Channel has good pool/riffle habitat	0362.045-0.6	Electroshock stream to id fish (PMT – not needed)	Field survey, 2002	
2	Stream	Reach 1	Channelized and very simplified, with no pools	0362.03	Remove rip-rap and re-meander stream	Field survey, 2002	Joint
3	Stream	Reach 3	Salmon Creek mainstem dries up	0362.06		Field survey, 2002	

Shaded rows reflect items that are information needs or opportunities, (and not necessarily problems)  
\* October 9<sup>th</sup> Revisions reflect discussions at the October 3<sup>rd</sup> PMT Meeting related to Local vs. Joint

No	Problem	Location	Description	Trib. & River Mile	Possible Additional investigations / Possible solutions	Source	Local, Joint, Combination?
4	Stream	Reach 2	Trib 0362G contributes most of baseflow to system	0362G.02	Electroshock stream to id fish (PMT – not needed)	Field survey, 2002	
5	Stream	Downstream of mouth of trib 0362G	Trib 0362G enters Salmon Creek (09.0362) Channel cuts through recent deposits of sand and gravel 6 feet deep w/debris jams 5-7 ft tall. Lack of pool habitat.	0362.45	Build sediment pond to trap and remove sediment	Field survey, 2002	L/J (but Joint in terms of potential Salmon habitat)
6	Fisheries	Reach 2	Channel very disturbed due to massive sedimentation with large fish passage barriers. No suitable in-stream habitat for spawning or rearing.	0362.03-0.4	Add more LWD to entrap sediment	Field survey, 2002	Joint
7	Fisheries	Reach 1	Blockage located on Sagale property. No access to verify	0362.02	Obtain permission to inspect and analyze blockage	Various reports	Joint
8	Fisheries	Reach 1	No fish observed during stream assessment	0362.05	Electroshock stream to id fish (PMT – not needed)	Field survey, 2002	
9	Wetland	Mallard Lake Park (Kingston pond)	Privately owned lake abutting White Center Park. Extensive shoreline erosion, waterfowl overuse, litter and probable poor water quality, apartment flooding		Lake could be connected to KC Parks and adjacent vacant land to create wetlands and form Greenway.	Field survey, 2002	Local
10	Wetland	SW 108 <sup>th</sup> St and 10Ave SW	Isolated wetland located on vacant parcel.		Could form middle link to Greenway linking White Center Pond to Lake Garret.	Field survey, 2002	
11	Wetland	White Center Pond	Inventoried as 1.7 acres but much larger. High use urban park w/numerous trails and camps		Could be enlarged/enhanced to create additional wetland area, provide R/D.	Field survey, 2002	
12	Wetland	Lake Hicks	Mosaic of seasonally connected wetlands in high use urban park		Wetlands could be enhanced to improve wildlife habitat (eg: amphibians).	Field survey, 2002	
24	Wetland	White Center Heights	Wetland at White Center Park poor quality		Wetland could be enhanced, potential for link to greenway	Field survey, 2002	
			<b>GEOLOGICAL</b>				
13	Erosion	Head of trib 0362G	Massive landslide at head of trib 0362G	0362G.01	Additional analysis to determine how to stabilize scarp	Field survey, 2002	
14	Erosion/Sediment Transport	All of ravine above sewage plant	On-going large landslides, small slumps, soil creep and piping transport sediment to the stream system. Limited stream channel and bank erosion contributes to slumping of banks. Sediment is primarily sand, with some gravel, silt and minor amounts of clay.	0362, 0362B, 0362G, 0362H, 0362I	The scale and cost of controlling erosion processes prohibitive. In-stream structures to control sediment transport could be considered, but may be impractical.	Field survey, 2002	

Shaded rows reflect items that are information needs or opportunities, (and not necessarily problems)

\* October 9<sup>th</sup> Revisions reflect discussions at the October 3<sup>rd</sup> PMT Meeting related to Local vs. Joint



No	Problem	Location	Description	Trib. & River Mile	Possible Additional investigations / Possible solutions	Source	Local, Joint, Combination?
14 B	Potential Ground Movement	Ravine	Risk of damage to sewer and stormwater pipelines through ravine due to soil movement around pipelines (0362 0.3 - 0.6). Potential for damage to private property at top of steep slopes.		Based on past performance, level of risk to pipelines appears low. Risk to private property not assessed (check Burien records).	Field survey, 2002; AESI report, 1999	
			<b>DRAINAGE &amp; ENGINEERING</b>				
15	Flooding	Standring Road	Flooding along road, backup from beach manhole that is damaged.		Access to assess problem is issue.	Burien, King County drainage complaints	
16	Flooding	Lake Garrett (also called Lake Hicks)	Flows overcome existing pump system and cause flooding		Conduct study re: correcting pump deficiencies. Determine downstream improvements to drainage system, tightline, needed as a result.	King County WLRD:	
17	Infrastructure	Lower Salmon Creek	Old Government Sewer line lacks capacity and is deteriorating under Ambaum Road		Conduct engineering investigation of condition of line.	Ken Krank, WLRD	
18	Infrastructure	Basin-wide	Under-utilized surface detention. Potential R/D in surface depressions appears under-utilized.		Investigate opportunities for increased live storage in depressions.	Field survey, 2002 City of Burien Stormwater Plan.	
19	Incorrect Mapping	King County portion of basin	The drainage system in King County is not adequately mapped. Information may be inaccurate or does not exist.		Improve mapping	KC Road data files	
			<b>WATER QUALITY</b>				
20	Lake WQ	Lake Garrett	<p>Listed on 303(d) list for exceeding water quality standards for Total Phosphorous</p> <p>Periodic blooms of blue-green algae</p> <p>Receives mostly untreated stormwater flows from surrounding residential area</p> <p>Eutrophic</p>		Implementation of nutrient control measures in watershed important to restoring lake water quality and stabilizing the trophic character of the lake.	King County Lake Water Quality, November 2001	

Shaded rows reflect items that are information needs or opportunities, (and not necessarily problems)

\* October 9<sup>th</sup> Revisions reflect discussions at the October 3<sup>rd</sup> PMT Meeting related to Local vs. Joint

No	Problem	Location	Description	Trib. & River Mile	Possible Additional investigations / Possible solutions	Source	Local, Joint, Combination?
21	Stormwater /stream	Basin-wide	Stormwater runoff quality likely is poor Most commercial areas do not have stormwater treatment facilities  Current residential areas do not have stormwater treatment facilities  Future residential development will probably not trigger treatment requirements.			Commercial facility files	
22	Stormwater /stream	Basin-wide	Pollutant Source Controls Businesses are not diligent in implementing pollutant source controls.		Mostly problem for Salmon Creek from the western portion of the basin; eastern basin bypasses Salmon Creek	Cedar/Green Source Control Project; 1997	
23	Groundwater	Basin-wide	Failing and Unsuitable septic systems Old failing septic systems in high density areas Businesses using septic systems – inappropriate wastes for undersized and old designs.		Unconfirmed for Salmon Creek; personal knowledge of unsewered areas; waiting for info from sewer district	Health Department; Southwest Suburban Sewer District	

Shaded rows reflect items that are information needs or opportunities, (and not necessarily problems)

\* October 9<sup>th</sup> Revisions reflect discussions at the October 3<sup>rd</sup> PMT Meeting related to Local vs. Joint